

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-24 are pending and rejected. Claims 1-18 and 25-30 were previously cancelled.

Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 19-23 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Albrecht et al., (hereinafter “Albrecht”), (US 5,821,494). Claims 19-23 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ainslie et al., (hereinafter “Ainslie”), (US 4,761,699). Claims 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Albrecht or Ainslie.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 19, the Office Action asserts it is not readily apparent what structure of the slider bonding pad permits re-use. *See* Office Action dated 11/14/2006, paragraph 2. Applicants maintain this is an improper rejection, as it is readily apparent from both the claim and the specification it is not a *structure* of the bonding pad permitting such re-use, but rather the bonding pad itself (“...wherein the slider bonding pad enables the reuse of the *suspension* by removing the connection between a slider and the slider bonding pad with heat treatment.”). *See* Specification page 3, lines 4-6.

Applicants further submit the cited references do not teach, suggest or describe at least “[a] suspension comprising ... wherein a plurality of traces extend longitudinally along the generally the center of a suspension, extend around the outer edges of a slider to the trailing edge of the slider, and electrically couple the slider to the suspension” (e.g., as described in claim 19).

The Office Action’s current rejection is based on Ainslie and Albrecht. However, neither reference describes these relevant limitations of claim 19. *See* e.g., Ainslie – Figures 2-7; and

Application No.: 09/741,684
Amendment and RCE dated: August 12, 2008
Reply to Examiner's Answer of June 12, 2008

Albrecht – Figures 1-22. The descriptions of these Figures in each reference fail to teach or suggest the relevant limitations as well.

As the cited reference fails to teach or describe at least the above limitation, the current rejection of claim 19 is lacking and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit claim 19 is allowable, and claims 20-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully reconsider the claims in light of the current amendments and withdraw the current rejections.

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: August 12, 2008

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501